

Applicants submit that this Amendment does not add new matter and its entry is respectfully requested. In view of the above Amendment and following Remarks, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

***Examiner Interview***

Applicants thank Examiner Zimmerman and Examiner Brown for extending the courtesy of an Examiner Interview to Applicants' representatives on November 15, 2002. During the Interview, Applicants representatives discussed clarifying the claims to capture that which Applicants regard as their invention.

***Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,742,905 to Pepe *et al.* ("Pepe"). By the foregoing amendment, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify that which they regard as their invention, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

In particular, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest "modifying a presentation format of the electronic message from the first message presentation format to a modified message presentation format ... wherein the modified message presentation format is other than the first message presentation format" as recited in claim 9. Pepe apparently discloses a system that, in part, performs "media translation" of an electronic message. This media translation, however, is with regard to the underlying transmission, transport, or protocol associated with the physical delivery of the electronic message from one terminal device to another terminal device. This media translation is not the same as Applicants' modification of a presentation format directed towards the appearance or other perception of the electronic message. Pepe requires a media translation in order to accommodate communication of messages between different types of devices and is entirely dependant upon the receiving device. Thus, for at least this reason, claim 9 is patentable over Pepe.

Claim 12 and new claims 38-45 depend from and add additional features to claim 9. For at least this reason, these claims are patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 38, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "modified message presentation format is specified by a user of the first terminal device." For at least this additional reason, claim 38 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 39, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "modified message presentation format is specified by a user of the second terminal device." For at least this additional reason, claim 39 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 40, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "modified message presentation format is other than the second message presentation format." For at least this additional reason, claim 40 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 41, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "modified message presentation format corresponds to a type of terminal device other than said first terminal device." For at least this additional reason, claim 41 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 42, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "modified message presentation format corresponds to a type of terminal device other than said first terminal device or said second terminal device." For at least this additional reason, claim 42 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 43, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "electronic message appears to have been sent to said second terminal device from a type of terminal device other than said first terminal device." For at least this additional reason, claim 43 is patentable over Pepe.

New claims 21-37 also include features not disclosed, taught or suggested by Pepe. More particularly, new claim 21 recites

a server system, coupling said first terminal device with said second terminal device, that receives an electronic message from said first terminal device, that modifies a presentation format of the electronic message from the first message presentation format to a modified message presentation format, and that sends the electronic message in the modified message presentation format to said second terminal device.

As discussed above, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest modifying a message presentation format of an electronic message. Accordingly, new claim 21 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 22, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "modified message presentation format is other than said first message presentation format." For at least this additional reason, claim 22 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 23, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "modified message presentation format is other than said second message presentation format." For at least this additional reason, claim 23 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 24, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "modified message presentation format is other than said first message presentation format" and further that the "modified message presentation format is other than said second message presentation format." For at least this additional reason, claim 24 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 25, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "modified message presentation format is specified by a user of said first terminal device." For at least this additional reason, claim 25 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 26, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "modified message presentation format corresponds to a type of terminal device other than said first terminal device." For at least this additional reason, claim 26 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 27, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "modified message presentation format corresponds to a type of terminal device other than said first terminal device or said second terminal device." For at least this additional reason, claim 27 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 28, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "electronic message appears to have been sent to said second terminal device from a type of terminal device other than said first terminal device." For at least this additional reason, claim 28 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 29, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "modified message presentation format is specified by a user of said second terminal device." For at least this additional reason, claim 29 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 32, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the server system includes "a scripting agent that modifies the presentation format of the electronic message from the first message presentation format to a modified message presentation format by performing a summary function on the electronic message." For at least this additional reason, claim 32 is patentable over Pepe.

Furthermore, with regard to claim 33, in addition to the features of claim 32, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the server system includes "at least one user profile and a scripting agent, wherein said scripting agent modifies the presentation format of the electronic message to said second terminal device in accordance with said user profile, and wherein said scripting agent modifies a presentation format of an electronic message from said second terminal device to said first terminal device in accordance with said user profile." For at least this additional reasons, claim 33 is patentable over Pepe.

Still further with regard to claim 34, in addition to the features of claims 32 and 33, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "scripting agent modifies the presentation format of the electronic message to said second terminal device by adding at least one of a signature block, a header, and a footer." For at least this additional reason claim 34 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 35, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest that the "modified presentation format of the electronic message received by said second terminal device is the same as a presentation format of an electronic message sent by

said second terminal device and received by said first terminal device." For at least this additional reason, claim 35 is patentable over Pepe.

Furthermore, with regard to claim 36, in addition to the features of claim 35, Pepe does not disclose, teach or suggest "a scripting agent that performs a summary function on the electronic message sent by said second terminal device prior to transmitting the electronic message to said first terminal device." For at least this additional reason, claim 36 is patentable over Pepe.

With regard to claim 37, Pepe does not disclose, teach, or suggest "a module that modifies a format of said electronic message from the first presentation format to a modified message presentation format, wherein said modified message presentation format is specified by one of a user of the first terminal device or a user of the second terminal device." For at least reason, claim 37 is independently patentable over Pepe.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: December 2, 2002

Respectfully submitted,



**29315**

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Rick A. Toering  
Registration No.: 43,195  
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND  
POPEO P.C.  
12010 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 900  
Reston, Virginia 20190  
703-464-4806

## APPENDIX

Please find marked-up versions of the claims identifying insertions and [deletions].

9. (Once Amended) A method for managing communications of [an] electronic messages [message] between [at least two terminal devices comprising] a first terminal device and a second terminal device, wherein the first terminal device has a first message presentation format and the second terminal device has [is a wireless terminal device having] a second message presentation format, the [communication management] method comprising [the steps of]:

receiving [the] an electronic message from [a sending] the first terminal device, said electronic message in [a sending terminal device] the first message presentation format;

modifying a presentation format of the electronic message from the first [sending terminal device] message presentation format to a [receiving terminal device] modified message presentation format; and

sending [transmitting] the electronic message in the modified message presentation format to the [receiving] second terminal device,

wherein the modified presentation format is other than the first message presentation format.

12. (Once Amended) The [communication management] method of claim 9, wherein [the] said modifying [step] comprises:

accessing a user profile; and

determining [an intended] a modified message presentation format based on the user profile and the second message presentation format [receiving terminal device format; and

modifying the sending terminal device format according to the intended format and the receiving terminal device format].

14. (Once Amended) A computer usable medium having computer readable program code embodied therein for managing communications of [an] electronic messages [message] between [at least two terminal devices comprising] a first terminal device and a second terminal device, wherein the first terminal device has a first message presentation format and the second terminal device [is a wireless terminal device having] has a second message presentation format, the computer readable code comprising:

computer code for causing a computer system to receive [the] an electronic message from [a sending] the first terminal device, the electronic message in [a sending terminal device] the first message presentation format;

computer code for causing a computer system to modify [the sending terminal device] a presentation format of the electronic message from the first message presentation format to a [receiving terminal device] modified message presentation format; and

computer code for causing a computer system to [transmit] send the electronic message in the modified message presentation format to the [receiving] second terminal device,

wherein the modified message presentation format is other than the first message presentation format.